line in Iraq. I do not know anyone who is not filled with gratitude for their sacrifice. Where I part with many of my colleagues is in my belief that the best way to support the troops is to bring them home as soon as possible, a position shared by a majority of the American people, by the way.

Helping war veterans is a top priority for me. But ironically, one that in an ideal world would hardly be necessary if the United States adopted what I call a SMART Security plan. War would be an absolute last resort, something we turn to reluctantly, only after every diplomatic channel has been pursued. The smart in SMART Security stands for Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism.

As the tragedy in London demonstrates, our belligerence has not made America or the world safer; and it is time, I believe, that we had a new approach, one that relies on multilateral alliances and improved intelligence to track and detain terrorists, one that renews our commitment to nuclear nonproliferation, one that invests aggressively in international development to attack the poverty and hopelessness that breed terrorism in the first place.

SMART is tough, pragmatic, and patriotic. It protects America by relying on the very best of American values: our commitment to freedom, our compassion for the people of the world, and our capacity for global leadership.

Criticism of our Iraq policy must never be misinterpreted as criticism of those on the ground carrying it out. We must stand with our veterans, the fearless Americans literally wearing the scars of a war that they did not choose. Just because a policy may be flawed, and I believe it is, does not detract from the remarkable job they do. We must show the same selflessness toward them that they have showed toward our Nation.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to issue a challenge to my colleagues, those who have criticized the comprehensive immigration reform that has been offered as legislation. In the last Congress, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and myself and Senator MCCAIN in the Senate offered comprehensive immigration reform. We have offered a similar bill this year. There have been a lot of critics who have taken the floor and have said that we should not do this; what we need to do rather than have comprehensive immigration reform is to simply secure the border and enforce the law, enforce the current law.

Let me just run down what that actually entails. If we were to enforce the current immigration laws that we have, it would mean that we would literally round up between 10 million and 15 million illegal aliens who are here presently, uproot them from their jobs, often from their families, and ship them home to their home country where they would be subject to a 10-year bar from reentry. After that 10 years, then they would get in line to go through the legal orderly process, which would probably take another 20 years.

Now, when I explain that to those who are critics of our immigration bill, they often say, well, we do not mean to enforce the current law as it is. Let us selectively enforce it. Let us go after the criminals, not after those who are legally law-abiding here. Well, that is called selective enforcement, and some will actually use that term. We need to selectively enforce the law. I ask the critics of comprehensive immigration reform, how is that any less of an amnesty than what has been proposed?

Under our legislation, anyone here illegally, who has broken no other law than crossing the border illegally, would be required to register, pay a fine, and wait as many as, at least 6 years until the current backlog of those going through the legal orderly process in their home country is complete. Then they would be forced to pay another $1,000 fine. How is that an amnesty, when simply selectively enforcing the current law is not?

Please explain. For those who are criticizing comprehensive immigration reform, how are you going to secure the border and enforce the law without a temporary worker program? Our legislation realizes that there are many here, probably around 8 million, that are in the workforce currently. Unless we are willing to uproot them and send them all home, then we have to have a temporary worker program or a guest worker program before we can enforce the law. That is why we have to have comprehensive immigration reform that says we need the rule of law.

In order to have the rule of law, we must have a law we can enforce. That is what this is all about, and that is the challenge I issue to those criticizing the comprehensive immigration reform that has been offered, the McCain-Kennedy-Kolbe-Flake-Gutierrez bill. Please come up with your own. Explain how we are going to enforce the current law unless we have a temporary worker program.

People say, let us secure the border first, enforce the current law, and then see if we need a guest worker program. I have already explained what it means to enforce the current law. If you believe that is what we need to do, please proffer a bill. Write legislation. If that is what we need to do, then, please, stand here and suggest it. Otherwise, join us. Join us in our quest to actually have a law that we can enforce. Let us have the rule of law. That is what this country was built on. That is what we need to return to.

It is not a healthy situation to have 10 million to 15 million people here illegally who are below the law, who work in the shadows. That is not healthy for national security. It is not good for our economy, and it is not humanitarian either. We simply need to change the law.

So I invite my colleagues, please, submit legislation. Join this great debate that we have, but do not criticize unless you are willing to offer legislation yourself.

CAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Central American Free Trade Agreement, according to Republican leadership, will come to a vote sometime this month. The Central American Free Trade Agreement was signed 13 months ago by President Bush. Every other trade agreement voted on in this Congress has been voted on within 2 months of the President's signature. That is, those trade agreements with Morocco and Chile, Singapore and Australia, all passed the Congress comfortably by wide margins within 60 days of the President affixing his signatures to them.

This trade agreement, CAFTA, was signed by President Bush in May of 2004, and it has not been brought to this Congress for a vote for one simple reason. One simple mathematical reason: the votes simply are not there to pass this agreement. The votes are not there because of the opposition from dozens of Republicans and Democrats, the opposition from small manufacturers and labor unions, and the deep and broad opposition from small farmers and from family farmers and ranchers and environmentalists. The opposition to CAFTA comes from Catholic bishops in Central America and Lutheran and Presbyterian and Jewish leaders in our country.

It is clear this agreement would not pass the House of Representatives today because Americans, in larger and larger numbers, including Members of Congress, representatives of the American people, understand our trade policy simply is not working.

Look at this chart. In 1992, the year I was first elected to Congress, we had a trade deficit. That means we exported less than we imported. We had a trade deficit of $28 billion. Last year, our trade deficit was $618 billion. From $38 billion to $618 billion trade deficit in only a dozen years. It is clear our trade policy is not working when we have these kinds of trade deficits, coupled with the budget deficits we have seen the last 5 years.

Now, these might just be numbers to economists, these numbers about the trade deficit, but here is what they really translate into. The States in red are States which have lost 20 percent of